UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,560	08/16/2006	Klaus Abraham-Fuchs	32860-001073/US	8514
	7590	EXAMINER		
P.O.BOX 8910	•	FUELLING, MICHAEL		
RESTON, VA	20195		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/18/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dcmailroom@hdp.com siemensgroup@hdp.com pshaddin@hdp.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/589,560	ABRAHAM-FUCHS ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
MICHAEL FUELLING	3626		

	MICHAEL FUELLING	3626					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 February 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	r, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		26/a) and the appropriat	o oxtonsion foo				
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount on hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL	lianaa wiith 07 CED 44 07 www.ha 6		6 +11-+6				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	w);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying the	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. ☑ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): <u>Only 35 USC 112</u> .							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: <u>N/A</u> .							
Claim(s) objected to: <u>N/A</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-23</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>N/A</u> .							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bubecause applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
13. Other:							
	/C. Luke Gilligan/						
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 3626					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's after Final amendment has been entered for purposes of appeal and the 112 rejections are withdrawn.

The examiner is appreciative of the applicant's efforts to further prosecution, however, this amendment does not place the case in a condition for allowance.

Applicant's argument is that the invention is patentable because it is drawn to a clinical study. The evidence of obviousness that the examiner has provided is for medical regimen, and clinical studies are medical regimen.

The Finality of the rejection is maintained.

Note: It is significant that applicant did not cancel claims 8, 15 and 18 which duplicate the portability of limitation (1). For completeness, the examiner's 103 rejection addressed both limitations (1) and (2) as being required. This after Final submission makes clear that only one of (1) or (2) actually is required. This further supports the examiner's finding that the claims are much broader than applicant argues.

The amendment also arguably introduces a new embodiment in that claims 9 and 19 now appear to include 2 separate input devices connected to the network while the disclosure describes only one input device being connected to the network. Nonetheless, the examiner has refrained from not entering the amendment based upon this defect because the examiner finds this is an obvious configuration taught by the relied upon art. Still, the applicant should have responded to the objection to the drawings. The drawings are described as flowcharts for the method, and there is no drawing which shows the claimed system(s).